



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/589,566	06/07/2000	Scott Andrew Fagen	POU9-1995-0064-US2	9642

7590

01/17/2003

Blanche E Schiller Esq
Heslin & Rothenberg PC
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, NY 12203

EXAMINER

KUPSTAS, TOD A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 01/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/589,566

Applicant(s)

FAGEN ET AL.

Examiner

Tod Kupstas

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 14, 16-19, 21-25 and 27-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 14, 16-19, 21-25 and 27-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2153

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 13,14,16-19, 21-25, and 27-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trugman (US 5,887,141) in view of Benayoun et al (US 5,771,227).

As set forth in claims 13, 18, 23, 24, 29, 32, and 35 Trugman discloses a method comprising: having one or more messages of a plurality of messages are being processed in the network (see fig. 2 for an overview of the network, and see col. 3, lines 16-27, and col. 6, lines 45-51 for the discussion of what the SWOs (session work objects) do; and determining completion of a problem associated with one or more messages of the plurality of messages; see col. 6, lines 41-44 (the completion of the SWOs is kept track of), said determining comprising checking a data structure to determine whether the problem is completed; see col. 7, lines 13-18, col. 6, lines 41-44, and col. 8, lines 21-35, (these sections describe the SWO and the corresponding activities surrounding them, completions and execution of these events are provided for in the object oriented system).

Art Unit: 2153

As set forth in claims 16, 21, 27, 31 and 34, Trugman discloses a method wherein said data structure collects results associated with said problem (part of utilizing the SWO scenario implies collecting the results of operating the SWO).

As set forth in claims 17, 22, and 28, Trugman discloses a method wherein the data structure is extendable to accommodate changes in the network; see col. 6, lines 19-33 (this sections describes the execution of SWO based upon changes in the network).

As set forth in claims 30 and 33, Trugman discloses a method wherein the determining completion of the transaction determines completion even though the number of messages of the transaction changes during processing (the SWOs in the system respond and operating in response to the system itself; see col. 5, lines 28-35).

As set forth in claims 13,14,16-19, 21-25, and 27-35, Trugman does not disclose having a system wherein the network is dynamically changing. Benayoun discloses a network wherein the nodes of the network can dynamically change transparently to the functioning of the network; see col. 1, lines 59-62. As set forth in claims 14, 19 and 25, Benayoun discloses a system wherein dynamically changing the network comprises at least on of adding a process to the network, changing a process of the network and deleting a process from the network (col. 1, lines 59-63 and col. 2, lines 17-24). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time this invention was made to have provided the system of Trugman, with the capability of sending messages smoothly while the network dynamically changes, as taught by Benayoun. The rationale is as follows: It would have been desirable to have continued the network operations

Art Unit: 2153

while the system lost or added nodes. As Benayoun teaches the desirability of continuously transmitting messages during the dynamically changes of the network, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated by Benayoun's teaching to have provided the system of Trugman with capability of dynamically changing the network while still processing messages, thereby having provided an efficient and flexible system in which to run the SWOs.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 30 is objected to because of the following informalities: In lines 1-2, of claim 30, "wherein the determining completion" should be --wherein determining completion--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments



4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13,14,16-19, 21-25, and 27-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tod Kupstas whose telephone number is (703) 305-2655.

Art Unit: 2153

The fax phone number for this art unit is (703) 305-7201. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the technology center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Tod Kupstas


1/15/03
GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100